

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's allowance of Claims 2, 5-8, 10-11, 14-17, 19, 21-22 and 24-27. Applicant will now address the Examiner's remaining objection and rejections in the Office Action.

Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objects to Claim 1 for an informality. In particular, the Examiner objects to the term "contact" in line 3. Applicant is correcting this typographical error so that the term is now "in contact."¹ It is respectfully submitted that this amendment corrects the informality, and it is requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 3-4

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 3-4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeson et al. (US 5,396,350) in view of Ma (US 6,352,350). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Previously in Amendment F, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amended independent Claim 1 to add the limitation of "a reflective liquid crystal panel under the prism-shaped lenses." Applicant then pointed out that Beeson did not disclose or suggest this feature, which the Examiner now admits.

The Examiner, however, is now contending that Beeson teaches all of the limitations of Claims 1, 3-4, except that Beeson does not teach a reflective LCD. Therefore, the Examiner cites

¹ Also see the further amendment below where this term is further amended to recite "in direct contact."

Ma as disclosing a reflective LCD. The Examiner then contends that it would have been obvious to modify the backlighting apparatus of Beeson with the reflective LCD taught by Ma.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In Beeson, the light appears to be only used as a backlight. In contrast, Ma discloses a front light reflective LCD. It is respectfully submitted that there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine a front light reflective LCD, such as that in Ma, into a backlight apparatus, such as that in Beeson. As stated in MPEP §2143.01, the mere fact that references could be combined is not enough. There must be some motivation to combine the references. Further, the proposed modification cannot change the principle of operation of a reference. MPEP §2143.01. In this case, changing from a backlight apparatus to use of a front light reflective LCD would be changing the operation of the Beeson device. Hence, this proposed modification by the Examiner is improper, and the rejection based thereon should be withdrawn.

While Applicant believes that this is a sufficient basis for overcoming the Examiner's rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending Claim 1 to recite a plurality of prism-shaped lenses each being in direct contact with a lower surface of the light guide plate.² As stated on page 21, lns. 6-9 of the present application, "...it is critical that each of the prism-shaped lenses 106 and the light guide plate 101 are in close contact with each other without any materials interposed therebetween." See also e.g. Fig. 1A.

In contrast, Beeson discloses "The light input surface 92 of microprisms 90 is attached to slab waveguide 6 via an adhesion layer 114."(emphasis added) See also e.g. Fig. 12 in Beeson.

² Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary states that Claim 8 is rejected, while the Office Action states that Claim 8 is allowable. For at least the reasons discussed in Applicant's previous response and herein, Applicant believes that Claim 8 is allowable. However, in order to ensure advancement of the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending Claim 8 to recite "a plurality of prism-shaped lenses each being in direct contact with a lower surface of the light guide plate." As discussed herein for Claim 1, this feature is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claim 8 is patentable over these references and should continue to be allowed.

Therefore, the alleged prism-shaped lenses in Beeson are not in direct contact with a lower surface of the alleged waveguide plate, and the device disclosed in Beeson is different than that of independent Claim 1 of the present application.

For at least the above-stated reasons, Claims 1 and 3-4 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references and are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 20, 23

The Examiner also rejects Claims 9, 20 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeson in view of Ma. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Beeson does not disclose an optical sensor as recited in independent Claim 9. As a result, the Examiner cites Ma and contends that Ma discloses an optical sensor (312) and that it would have been obvious to modify the apparatus of Beeson with the optical sensor of Ma to arrive at the claimed invention.

While Applicant is not agreeing that this combination of references is proper and while Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant has amended independent Claim 9 to recite “an optical sensor for reading an object” (see e.g. Figs. 12A and 12B of the present application) which clearly distinguishes the claimed invention from Ma.

In contrast, the Examiner cites the polarizing system 312 in Ma. However, as stated in col. 4, ln. 66 - col. 5, ln. 1 of Ma, the polarizing system passes light having a desired polarization state and reflects light having an undesired polarization state. This polarizing system is clearly different than the claimed optical sensor of Claim 9. Accordingly, independent Claim 9 and those claims

dependent thereon are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references but are patentable thereover. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant is filing an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) herewith. It is respectfully requested that this IDS be entered and considered prior to the issuance of any further action on this application.

If any further fee should be due for this IDS, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this Amendment, please charge our deposit account no. 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: *February 25, 2005*



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street; Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568